UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,017	09/19/2001	Bryan C. Turner	95-468	8322

23164 7590 08/24/2006

LEON R TURKEVICH
2000 M STREET NW
7TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 200363307

EXAMINER	
HOSSAIN, TANIM M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/955,017	TURNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tanim Hossain	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26,34 and 35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26,34 and 35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-26, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovacs (U.S. 2002/0023147) in view of Raniere (U.S. 2004/0210635) in further view of Hatanaka (U.S. 5,926,177).

As per claim 1, Kovacs teaches at least one interaction component of a user input resource configured for receiving user inputs, and a display controller configured for display of data (paragraph 0042); a network interfaced configured for receiving, via an open protocol network, information associated with a first network service, the first network service supplied to the user based on interaction exchange of service transaction messages between a corresponding group of service objects including a model object, a view object, and a controller object associated with the first network service (paragraphs 0054, figure 4); and a controller configured for executing the received one service object for providing the first network service to the user based on the exchange of transaction messages (0054). Kovacs teaches an open protocol network (figure 1), but does not specifically teach the movement of service objects through a network. Raniere teaches the transmitting of view objects through a network in response to user

input (paragraph 0033). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to move service objects through the network based on user need as taught by Raniere in the system of Kovacs. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that moving objects between users would allow sharing, such that different users can manipulate the objects simultaneously, which facilitates communication. Both inventions are from the same field of endeavor, namely the manipulation of a MVC paradigm for gathering information. Kovacs-Raniere does not specifically teach the selective termination of the service object based on reception of a second object through the network. Hatanaka teaches the selective termination of an object which is replaced by a second object, which is in this case a view object (column 2, lines 7-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to terminate an object based on the reception of a second object. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that after the reception of a second object, the user no longer needs the first one, for example. All inventions are from the same field of endeavor, namely the MVC-driven gathering of data.

As per claim 2, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the device of claim 1, wherein the device includes the user input resource as the at least one user interaction component, the network interface configured for receiving the controller object as the corresponding service object, the controller configured for executing the controller object by supplying, via the network interface, a first service transaction message to the model object executed remotely at a prescribed destination on the open protocol network based on a corresponding user input detected by the user input resource (Kovacs: 0042, 0054).

As per claim 3, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the device of claim 2, wherein the device is configured for providing the first network service based solely on execution of the

controller object, wherein the model object and view object are executed remotely relative to the device (Kovacs: 0042, 0054; Raniere: 0033).

As per claim 4, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the device of claim 2, wherein the network interface is configured for receiving the model object from the open protocol network, the controller configured for executing the model object locally and redirecting the first service transaction messages generated by the controller object from the model object executed remotely to the model object executed locally, the model object outputting second service transaction messages based on the controller messages to the view object for the first network service (Kovacs: 0042, 0054; Raniere: 0033).

As per claim 5, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the device of claim 4, wherein the controller, in response to receiving a message via the network specifying a new remote model object superseding the model object executed locally, redirects the first service transaction messages generated by the controller object to the new remote model object via the network interface (Kovacs: 0042, 0054, 0091; Raniere: 0033; Hatanaka: 2; 7-10).

As per claim 6, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the device of claim 5, wherein the first network service provides sending of instant messages to remote users (Kovacs: 0073).

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected on the same bases as claim 1.

As per claim 9, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the executing step includes providing the first network service based solely on execution of the controller object, wherein the model object and view object are executed remotely relative to the device (Kovacs: 0091).

As per claim 10, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the receiving step further includes receiving the model object from the open protocol network, the executing step including: redirecting the first service transaction messages generated by the controller object from the model object executed remotely to the model object executed locally (Kovacs: 0054, 0091); and outputting, by the model object executed locally, second service transaction messages to the view object for the first network service based on the controller messages (Kovacs: 0054, 0091).

As per claim 11, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches the method of claim 10, wherein: the receiving step further includes receiving a message via the network specifying a new remote model object superseding the model object executed locally (Kovacs: 0054, 0091); the executing step includes redirecting the first service transaction messages to the new remote model object via the network, and terminating execution of the model object executed locally (Hatanaka: 2; 7-10).

Claim 12 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Claims 13-26 are rejected on the same bases as claims 1-11.

As per claim 34, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka further teaches that the receiving, executing and selectively terminating each are executed by the network-enabled user interface device (Hatanaka: 2; 7-10).

As per claim 35, Kovacs-Raniere-Hatanaka teaches a network enabled user interface device comprising: at least one user interaction component, the one user interaction component being one of a user input resource configured for receiving user inputs and a display controller configured for display of data; means for receiving, via an open protocol network, at least one

service object being one of a model object, a view object, and a controller object for a first network service; and means for executing the at least one service object for the first network service, by exchanging service transaction messages between the other service objects, based on the corresponding at least one user interaction component, the means for executing configured for selectively terminating the received one service object based on reception, via the open protocol network, of a second service object for a corresponding second network service (Kovacs: 0042, 0054, 0091; Raniere: 0033; Hatanaka: 2; 7-10).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on June 8, 2006 have fully been considered, but are not persuasive.

a. Applicant asserts that Kovacs fails to teach the execution of service objects in a user interface device. Examiner respectfully disagrees, as a user interface device may be a range of devices, including a client computer as discussed in Kovacs. Because the view object can be manipulated by the client for example, the client necessarily contains the service object. The execution of a service object may be constituted by GUI inputs, which clearly takes place in Kovacs. Further, for the MVC to have functionality, service transaction messages would have to be exchanged between the respective model, view, and controller objects.

b. A broad reasonable interpretation of a MVC paradigm is constituted in the viewing of HTML pages, where the display is the view. As such, given that Raniere deals in the transferring of objects, which may obviously include HTML pages, display features, or other data, it fits into

the field of an MVC paradigm. It may therefore be combined with the other references to arrive at the claimed invention.

c. Hatanaka discloses the termination of a view object in response to new information, or updates, which may constitute a new service. Because a new view object arrives, the old one is rendered obsolete and is thus terminated. Raniere emphasizes the transference of a view object through a network, and a combination of transferring a view object through a network with a system in which new view objects are created and displayed would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER